

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHRIS EPPERSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

DANIEL CEDERBORG,

Defendant.

No. 1:20-cv-01500-NONE-SKO

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS

(Doc. No. 8)

On October 23, 2020, plaintiff Chris Epperson, proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, filed a complaint initiating this action. (Doc. No. 1.) On November 10, 2020, the assigned magistrate judge screened the complaint, found that it failed to state an adequate basis for subject matter jurisdiction or any cognizable federal claim, and granted Plaintiff twenty-one (21) days leave to file an amended complaint to attempt to cure the pleading deficiencies identified in the order. (Doc. No. 4.)

On December 18, 2020, plaintiff filed a document titled “Amend Complaint – evident.”<sup>1</sup> (Doc. No. 5.) On January 15, 2021, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending that plaintiff’s amended complaint be dismissed with prejudice and without further leave to amend. (Doc. No. 8.) Plaintiff was served with those findings and recommendations and was granted twenty-one (21) days in which to file any objections thereto.

---

<sup>1</sup> On January 6, 2021, after the time to file an amended complaint had expired, plaintiff filed another document titled “Amend Complaint.” (Doc. No. 6.)

1 (*Id.*) On March 3, 2021,<sup>2</sup> plaintiff filed a document titled “Objection to Magistrate Judge’s  
2 Findings and Recommendation.”<sup>3</sup> (Doc. No. 11.)

3 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this court has conducted a  
4 *de novo* review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court finds that the  
5 findings and recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis.

6 Accordingly,

- 7 1. The findings and recommendations issued January 15, 2021 (Doc. No. 8) are adopted  
8 in full;  
9 2. This action is dismissed with prejudice; and  
10 3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this case.

11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 Dated: **March 19, 2021**

13   
14 \_\_\_\_\_  
15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 \_\_\_\_\_  
24 <sup>2</sup> On January 22, 2021, Plaintiff filed a notice of change of address, after which he was re-served  
25 with the findings and recommendations. (Doc. No. 9.) On February 16, 2021, plaintiff contacted  
26 the court, stating that he had not received the findings and recommendations. Plaintiff was re-served  
with the findings and recommendations by mail that day, and the twenty-one-day period to file  
objections was reset.

27 <sup>3</sup> The document contains a discussion of Article I, Section 1 of the Constitution and does not address  
28 the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendation recommending that plaintiff’s complaint be  
dismissed.